

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 11 and 12 are currently pending in this application. Claims 11 and 12 are independent.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate acceptance of the formal drawings filed on March 16, 2004.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,791,703 ("Maeda"). For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a printing method, adaptable to any network environment, wherein print information resources existing at a certain node may be sent to a network printer without having a computer fetch the information resources and then send the fetched information resources to the printer. Previously presented claims 11 and 12 require, in part, the print acceptance screen to have: (i) a first area for a user to specify a peripheral device to acquire print data; (ii) a second area for a user to specify a given condition when the peripheral device requires the print data; and (iii) a third area for a user to specify a network printer on the network made to print on the basis of the print data.

In particular, the second area is for a user to *specify a given condition* at the time when a peripheral device acquires the print data. The given condition may be any condition imposed on the node where the print data exists (*see Specification, Figure 12 for examples of conditions such as resolution, number of colors, pages, mode, etc.*) Such an inventive feature will advantageously allow a user to specify a condition quickly, while viewing the first area for specifying a peripheral device and the third area for specifying a printer. There is no need to save the conditions in advance or switch screens.

Maeda, in contrast to the claimed invention, is completely silent about the print acceptance screen having *three distinct areas*. Maeda relates to an image processing apparatus allowing a user to obtain data on a desirable World Wide Web server and print the obtained data (*see Maeda, Abstract*). In the Office Action (page 3, lines 2—3), the Examiner asserts that Maeda discloses “a second area (the Setting section of Figure 6 and column 7, lines 27-32) for a user to specify a given condition...” Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Figure 6 of Maeda does *not* have a purported “Setting section”. Second, lines 27-32 of column 7 of Maeda read “(5) Option File ‘Option file’ **505** is a file in which all the conditions set by the print utility are stored. An option file **505** is prepared for each user in advance and for this item a specific file is specified, so that all the items can be collectively set up.” This is clearly different from what the present invention discloses as recited in claims 11 and 12. The present invention requires a second area for a user to specify a given condition. As clearly illustrated in FIG. 12 of the present application, the second area D2 explicitly shows a list of conditions (such as resolution, number of colors, pages, mode, *etc.*) for the user to specify. In contrast, the “option file” area **505** in Maeda has a list of option *files* such as “Setting1” for a user to choose. Consequently, the option files in Maeda need to be prepared *in advance*.

Further, referring to column 10, lines 1-3 of Maeda, when the "Print Setup" button in Figure 6 is pressed, a separate operating screen as shown in Figure 7 is called and HTML print options may be checked. This is also clearly distinct from the present invention, wherein all three areas are present in the screen, as required by claims 11 and 12 and clearly shown in FIG. 12.


In view of the above, it is clear that Maeda fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Thus, independent claims 11 and 12 are patentable over Maeda for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783.012002).

Dated: February 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jonathan P. Osha 
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments